

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 26, 2008. In this Office action claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 24-31 were rejected and claims 14-23 and 32-41 were objected to.

Applicant first respectfully notes that the Office Action did not address claims 55-68 added via Applicant's last amendment. It is believed these claims are allowable for the reasons stated in Applicant's last amendment. Consideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

The undersigned encourages to the Examiner to call the undersigned to resolve any outstanding issues after consideration of this amendment, or to suggest other clarifying amendments to render the application allowable.

The Office Action reports that claims 14-23 and 32-41 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. While Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner, for the indication of allowable subject matter, it is believed the amended independent claims are allowable for the reasons discussed below.

The Office Action first reports that claims 1-2 and 4-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. With this amendment, independent claims 1 and 24, as well as claim 55 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action next reports that claims 1-2, 4-13 and 24-31 were rejected as being unpatentable in view of Meyers et al. "Alignment of Shared Forests for Bilingual Corpora" and Horiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,243,669). In Applicant's prior response with respect to claim 24, Applicant's argued that claim 24 was amended to clarify the invention recited therein from Meyers et al. wherein, in particular, claim 24 now recite "aligning nodes of the dependency structures

with correspondences on the tangible medium as a function of a set of rules comprising at least three different rules, wherein the dependency structures comprise a set of unaligned nodes and wherein after each of the rules are applied any aligned nodes are removed from the set of unaligned nodes before applying another rule.” (Emphasis added) Similarly, claim 55 was believed allowable because it recited “aligning nodes of the dependency structures with correspondences on the tangible medium as a function of a set of rules comprising at least two different rules where aligned nodes are determined based on the parent/child structure.” For the reasons stated in Applicant’s prior response, which are hereby incorporated by reference, it is believed these claims are allowable. Applicant’s further incorporate by reference the statements made in Applicant’s prior amendment regarding that Meyers does not teach or suggest eliminating tentative correspondences.

Nevertheless, in order to further clarify the patentable differences between the present invention recited in the independent claims with respect to the cited art, applicants have further amended claims 1, 25 and 55. Each of these claims now recite that “...aligning does not require beginning with either a top or bottom node of the hierarchical parent/child structure of the dependency structures...” (Emphasis added) Support for this feature is found in the Specification at least at page 26, lines 8-20. This feature is in complete contrast to Meyers et al. for they specifically teach at page 1, right-hand column, second paragraph under section 2, “Our alignment program employs dynamic programming algorithms, which are described in detail in later sections. The program begins at the roots of the source and target trees, and proceeds top-down recursively, filling in the matrix scores.” (Emphasis added). For this reason at least, it is respectfully submitted that the

rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 24 includes the feature recited above, but also further recites “and wherein aligning is not based on top-down processing or bottom-up processing of nodes....” Again, support is found in the Specification at least at page 26, lines 8-20. This feature is also in direct contrast with Meyers et al. Accordingly, , it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 55 includes the feature recited above as discussed with respect to claim 1, but also further recites “and wherein an order of aligning nodes is based on linguistic relevance, beginning with aligning nodes having more linguistic relevance than aligning nodes having less linguistic relevance” Again, support is found in the Specification at least at page 26, lines 8-20 as well as at page 28, lines 8-12. It is respectfully believed that this claim is allowable.

The foregoing remarks are intended to assist the Office in examining the application and in the course of explanation may employ shortened or more specific or variant descriptions of some of the claim language. Such descriptions are not intended to limit the scope of the claims; the actual claim language should be considered in each case. Furthermore, the remarks are not to be considered exhaustive of the facets of the invention which are rendered patentable, being only examples of certain advantageous features and differences, which applicant’s attorney chooses to mention at this time. For the foregoing reasons, applicant reserves the right to submit additional evidence showing the distinction between applicant’s invention to be unobvious in view of the prior art.

Furthermore, in commenting on the references and in order to facilitate a better understanding of the differences that are expressed in the claims, certain

details of distinction between the same and the present invention have been mentioned, even though such differences do not appear in all of the claims. It is not intended by mentioning any such unclaimed distinctions to create any implied limitations in the claims.

An extension of time for consideration of this response is hereby requested. An online charge authorization for the extension of time fee is provided.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims is solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:dkm